

the wrong public relations signal. That was the word that came out: We did not want to send the wrong signal. Public relations was apparently more important than the lives of the American servicemen that were on the line.

In case anyone has forgotten, that helicopter went down and they defended themselves from attack and they called for reinforcements. And reinforcements tried to come from the airport compound but they did not have armored personnel carriers. And when people shot at them from both sides they pinned down the reinforcements, they could not get through to help them. American forces held out as long as they could and, when their ammunition ran out, when their ammunition ran out the Somalis came and hacked them to pieces. And the armored personnel carriers that they requested and had been turned down by the Secretary of Defense for PR reasons, could have saved their lives.

We are not playing games. This is not a PR move. These are real troops and real bullets in a real civil war. We are risking American lives. For what? Because you are going to end a 500-year-old conflict? Do not be silly.

Because these people, with American troops' presence, will suddenly honor their peace commitments that they have never honored in 500 years? Somebody would like to sell you some land in Florida, if you really believe that.

The truth is, I do not believe we have placed a high enough value on the lives of the Americans who serve our country in uniform. The question is not whether or not they should ever risk their lives. No one should go in the military not knowing they do that. Americans are willing to risk their lives and we are willing to shed our blood for freedom around the world, and we have done it more effectively and more efficiently than any people in modern history. But the line is drawn when you ask Americans to give their lives for nothing. I believe that is morally wrong. I believe it is morally wrong, to have Americans give their lives in Somalia when you do not have a clear military mission and you will not stand behind them.

It is not wrong to ask them to give their lives and shed their blood. It is wrong to ask them to do it for nothing, and that is what we did in Somalia. It is wrong to ask them to do it for nothing in Lebanon, which is precisely what happened. It is wrong to ask them to do it for nothing in Vietnam, when our very leaders would not stand behind the men and women who risked their lives.

I believe it is wrong, it is morally wrong for us to send young people to Bosnia to risk their lives in the middle of a civil war among people who have not honored a peace agreement.

Some would say, if we do it, at least they have had their chance. Tell me how you would feel, looking into the eyes of a parent who had lost his or her only child. "Yes, your son or daughter

died, but at least we gave them a chance." Would it not be fair and reasonable to ask, "Was it a good idea? Did it have reasonable prospects to succeed? Did you do everything you could to protect them?"

Mr. President, what we are faced with is a decision that degrades the value of American servicemen and servicewomen. It says that their blood can be shed on a whim; that they are pawns in a chess game; that their lives are not important enough for us to take seriously.

I believe every person who puts on a uniform has an obligation to this country, and the obligation goes to laying down their very lives. But I think it is wrong for us to think that obligation runs in only one direction.

This country has an obligation to those who serve it as well, and that obligation is to make sure we never put them in harm's way unless it is on a clear, achievable, military mission, one that we are committed to win. Then I think we have the right to ask everything in the world from them, everything they can give, because the existence of freedom in this world depends on them. What we see is an effort to cheapen the value of the lives of young Americans who are willing to serve this country. I, for one, will not vote to authorize it.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

#### VISIT TO THE SENATE BY ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER SHIMON PERES

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I have the honor, along with Senator PELL from the Foreign Relations Committee, of presenting the new Prime Minister from Israel, Shimon Peres.

I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess for 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECESS

Thereupon, at 5:45 p.m., the Senate recessed until 5:52 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. GRAMS).

Mr. NICKLES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

#### THE VISIT OF PRIME MINISTER SHIMON PERES

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I would like to join with my colleagues in complimenting our distinguished guest, Prime Minister Peres, for an outstanding speech to a joint session of Congress. I have heard several of them in my years in the Senate. But the Prime Minister's speech, which called for peace and continuing movement in the peace arena, I think is certainly to be complimented. And we are delighted to have him as our guest both in speaking

to a joint session of Congress, but also as our guest this evening in the Senate.

It is an honor to have him in the Senate.

#### THE BOSNIA ISSUE

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I wish to speak in opposition to the President's decision to deploy ground troops and ground forces in Bosnia.

I first would like to compliment Senator HUTCHISON, Senator INHOFE, Senator BROWN, and Senator THOMAS as well for outstanding speeches. Some of the best speeches that have been made in the Senate have been made this evening. Senator BROWN just concluded with a very moving speech detailing his opposition to the President's move. I agree wholeheartedly with their comments.

I also will make a comment. I have been to Yugoslavia with Senator DOLE. Some people are saying these resolutions are in opposition to each other. I would take issue with that fact. One of the resolutions we are going to be voting on that I had something to do with, or was involved with, said that we state our opposition to the President's decision to deploy ground troops in Bosnia—very clear, very plain, very simple. We think the President is making a mistake, and we want to be on record of it.

Mr. President, I will go further. I wish that we would have had a similar resolution when the President made the decision to deploy our Armed Forces into Haiti. I think he made a mistake. I have heard others in the administration say that was a success, and maybe that is the way they would define success. But I thought it was a mistake to have the invasion and occupation of Haiti.

I wish that we would have had a chance to debate that and that we would have had a sensible debate on it. We did not have that.

So I am pleased that we are going to have debate on these two resolutions today and tomorrow. Some of my colleagues said, "Well, we wish we could have had more extensive debate." I would agree with that. But the President is going to Paris tomorrow evening to sign an accord on Thursday, and not only will the Senate be taking this up but the House will be. So it is important for us to take it up today and dispose of these two resolutions—maybe three resolutions—by tomorrow.

Also, Mr. President, I want to make just a couple of comments on how we got here and why I have decided to oppose the President's decision to deploy these troops.

In the first place, I mentioned my opposition to the President's decision on sending troops into Haiti. Senator BROWN commented on the President's mistaken mission in Somalia where the mission moved from a humanitarian mission into that of peace enforcing, or peacekeeping, and a greatly expanded humanitarian role that resulted in the loss of 18 American lives.